



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,416	12/01/1999	AKIHIRO ICHIGE	2185-0382P	5804

7590

01/03/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP  
P O BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040

EXAMINER

NAKARANI, DHIRAJLAL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/442,416

Applicant(s)

ICHIGE ET AL.

Examiner

D. S. Nakarani

Art Unit

1773

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1773

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 23, 2002 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For the reasons of record set forth in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed May 29, 2002 (Paper No. 5).
4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:  
  
(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1773

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meilhon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,356,677) in view of Applicants' own admission (page 2 lines 17-28).

Meilhon et al disclose a shrinkable thermoplastic packaging film having tear strength in machine direction at least twice the tear strength in transverse direction (Abstract). Meilhon et al's multilayer film comprises at least one layer of olefinic polymer such as polyethylene, polypropylene, copolymer of ethylene and propylene, ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer etc and at least one layer of ionic copolymer (col. 3 line 5 to col. 4 line 42). Meilhon et al. also disclose thickness of ionic copolymer 5 to 70% of the total film thickness (col. 4 lines 52-55). Meilhon et al. also suggest adhesive layer between polyolefin layer and the ionic copolymer layer to increase the adhesion between the layers of different natures (col. 5 lines 5-12). Meilhon et al teach ratio of Elmendorf tear strength in machine direction (MD) to Elmendorf tear strength in transverse direction (TD) greater than or equal to 2. Meilhon et al's Examples show ratio MD/TD higher than 3 (see Examples) Meilhon et al. fail to show tear strength in machine direction of not less than about 30 kg/cm, claimed breaking point and claimed dispenser with roll of wrapping film.

Applicants admit that placing packaging film roll in dispenser is known in the packaging art.

Meilhon et al's polymers for making multilayer film are same as instant invention, therefore the film deemed to be self-tacky.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention made to utilize disclosure of Meilhon et al. to produce a multilayer

Art Unit: 1773

film having desired tear strength in machine direction by varying individual layer forming polymers and stretching ratio and place roll in the known dispenser for packaging food items.

No claims are allowed.


6. Applicants are requested to note that the process of making a shrinkable thermoplastic packaging film disclosed by Meilhon et al. is different than the process of making a multilayer layer film of instant disclosure. The process disclosed in the instant disclosure is identical to the process disclosed by Yamanaka et al.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D.S. Nakarani whose telephone number is 703-308-2413. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J. Thibodeau can be reached on 703-308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

D. S. Nakarani/rmn  
January 2, 2003

  
**D. S. NAKARANI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**